REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4 -7, 9, 10 and 12-14 are pending. Claims 3, 8 and 11 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Claims 1, 4 and 9 have been amended to respectively recite elements of canceled claims 3, 8 and 11. Claims 12-14 have been added. No new matter is added.

Rejection Under U.S.C. 35 § 102

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by JP Publication No. 2003021753 to Kubota et al ("Kubota"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection with respect to claim 1. Claim 3 has been canceled, thus rendering moot the rejection with respect to claim 3.

Kubota was published on January 24, 2003 in the Japanese language. The present application was filed on June 25, 2003 and claims priority to Japanese Application No. 2002-292817 ("the Priority Application") which was filed on October 4, 2002. A proper claim of foreign priority was made concurrent with the filing of the present application, and the Examiner has acknowledged this priority claim, as well as the receipt of a certified copy of the Priority Application.

As the publication date of Kubota is later than the October 4, 2002 filing date of the Priority Application, Kubota does not constitute prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102. In accordance with MPEP § 201.15, filed concurrently herewith is a certified literal translation of the Priority Application, and a Statement of Accuracy (**Attachment A**). Support for the present claims can be found at least in the certified translation of the claims of the Priority Application. Because Kubota is not available as prior art, the rejection is rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1-3 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,419,810 to Tanaka et al. ("Tanaka"). Claims 3 and 11 have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection moot with respect to claims 3 and 11.

Applicants submit that Tanaka discloses a method of manufacturing an optical fiber connector including the steps of immersing a negative electrode line 9 and a positive electrode 4 in an electroforming solution 3 in an electroforming bath 50 (Tanaka, Fig. 2), depositing metal on the electrode line 9 by electroforming (Tanaka, column 7, lines 31-33), and taking out the electrode line 9 from the electroformed element to form a through hole (Tanaka, column 10, lines 24-30). An optical fiber is then inserted into the ferrule formed by the electroformed element (Tanaka, column 11, line 58). Tanaka discloses in the case of lines formed of insulative material that "it is necessary to apply electroless plating based on, for example nickel or silver, in order to give conductivity to the surface." (Tanaka, column 9, lines 57-59 and Fig. 7.) An electrically insulating member 20 is disclosed as disposed on the wire member 9, and peeled off after the electro-forming process.

Amended independent claims 1 and 9 recite "the dummy line including an electrical insulating material on at least an outer surface thereof." In contrast, Tanaka does not disclose that

the outer surface of the wire member 9 has an insulating material. Therefore, Applicants submit that Tanaka does not disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1 and 9. Thus, Tanaka does not anticipate the invention of claims 1 and 9.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Claim 10 depends from claim 9. Applicants submit that claims 2 and 10 are patentable over Tanaka for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of the Examiner's statement of what was known in the art. Claim 8 has been canceled, thus rendering the rejection moot with respect to claim 8.

The Examiner contends that Tanaka discloses most of the features of claims 4-7. The Examiner acknowledges that Tanaka does not disclose that the positioning hole is used to fit the ferrule into another ferrule. The Examiner relies on his statement that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to use one of the holes of the multiple-core ferrule for positioning because it obviates the use of an external holder.

Tanaka discloses using an adapter 140 for connecting an optical cable 120 to another optical cable (column 18, lines 2-5); the adapter 140 is shown external to the ferrules (Fig. 17). Tanaka does not disclose or suggest using positioning holes within the ferrule to fit one ferrule into another. Although the positioning holes of the claimed invention present a clear advantage over the adapter of Tanaka and may seem obvious in hindsight, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated by Tanaka to include the positioning holes of the claimed invention.

Further, claim 4 has been amended to recite "the dummy line including an electrical insulating material on at least an outer surface thereof." The arguments made above with respect to claims 1 and 9 is equally applicable to claim 4. Applicants submit that the combination of Tanaka and the Examiner's statement neither discloses nor suggests the invention of claim 4. Therefore, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not met the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness over claim 4.

Further regarding claim 7, the Examiner contends that Tanaka discloses "covering parts of the wire with the electrically insulating member" (column 10, line 55). Applicants have demonstrated above that Tanaka further discloses "the electrically insulated member 20 is peeled off from the electroformed product to expose the wire member." It is clear that Tanaka does not disclose a dummy line with the electrical insulating material because Tanaka discloses peeling off the insulating member from the electroformed element. Thus, claim 7 is not obvious in view of Tanaka.

Claims 5-7 depend from claim 4 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 4. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 4-6 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota. Claim 8 has been canceled, thus rendering the rejection moot with respect to claim 8. For the reasons set forth above, Kubota does not constitute prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and, thus, Kubota is not available to be used as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Therefore, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not met the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness over claims 4-6.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004-0037510 to Mukouda. Claims 3, 8 and 11 have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection moot with respect to claim 3, 8 and 11.

The Examiner contends that Tanaka discloses most of the features of the claimed invention. The Examiner admits that Tanaka does not disclose applying current only to the negative electrode line. The Examiner relies on Mukouda as disclosing a method of manufacturing a metal multi-ferrule in which current should be applied to one core wire and then applied to surrounding core wires. The Examiner contends that that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Tanaka and Mukouda to achieve the claimed invention.

Mukouda discloses a method wherein "the current should be applied first to one core wire that is positioned in the center of plural core wires, so as to form an electrocoating on the core wire in the center, and then the current is applied sequentially to the adjacent core wires to form an electrocoating thereon." (Mukouda, Paragraph 109.) Therefore, the surface of each core wire disclosed by Mukouda is conductive since an electrocoating is formed on each core wire.

Amended independent claims 1, 4 and 9 recite "the dummy line including an electrical insulating material on at least an outer surface thereof." Tanaka does not disclose this feature as demonstrated above. In contrast, Mukouda discloses core wires with conductive surfaces. Therefore, the combination of Tanaka and Mukouda neither discloses nor suggests the invention of claims 1, 4 and 9. Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Claims 5-7 depend from claim 4. Claim 10 depends from claim 9. Applicants submit that claims 2, 5-7, and 10 are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. Applicants submit that the Examiner has not meet the

burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness over claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9 and 10. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

Each and every point raised in the Office Action dated July 7, 2005 has been addressed on the basis of the above amendments and remarks. In view of the foregoing it is believed that claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 10 and 12-14 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: October 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Richard J. Katz
Registration No.: 47,698
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

ATTACHMENT